

KINGS' CHILDREN OF CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR.

C. F. YODER.

While the coming Conference is in the mind and heart of the brotherhood it may be well to consider a few things in regard to our young people's work. Our organizations are crystalizing, our policy is taking shape; but as yet Conference has allowed the young people's movement to shape itself. There should be a vital relation and co-operation between the two,—something more than a brief report each year.

In the following outline I have tried to present the scope of our work and the means of accomplishing it, showing some faults in our present condition and suggesting a few propositions for our future policy. The object of the movement is two-fold,—

1. To promote the activity and usefulness of our young people.

2. To utilize this activity in the Brethren church.

The first object is to be accomplished,—

1. By proper local organization.

2. By keeping the societies in touch with each other,—

(a) By means of District organizations.

(b) “ “ “ literature.

(c) “ “ “ mass conventions.

3. By keeping in touch with the world movement,—

(a) By uniform topics and methods.

(b) By co-operation in C. E. conventions.

(c) By literature of the movement.

The second object is to be accomplished,

1. By keeping the local organization loyal to the local church.

2. By keeping the District and National organizations under the control of Conference.

3. By presenting definite objects to work for, e. g. Support of Tract work, etc.

4. By a denominational paper.

Most of these points we have already gained but a few we have not. In securing the first object we fail,—

1. By defective local organization. Some societies are only partially organized. Two vital principles which have helped make the world-movement a success, are omitted in the constitution, e. g. The element of obligation and the regular consecration service.

2. By lack of co-operation in the world movement.

Many of our societies and older people too, to their shame, know but little of the grand movements outside of our own church. On account of the omission of these two principles our K. C. societies are debarred from co-operation in C. E.

conventions. (See introductions to K. C. and C. E. constitutions.)

In securing the second object our District and National organizations are not sufficiently under the control of Conference. I elected the first board and should have elected the second. Conference in '92 gave directions which the board violated inasmuch as it has prevented rather than promoted co-operation in Y. P. S. C. E. conventions.

Conference has presented no definite work for the young people. It has not defined the duties of the board but has left it with unlimited power to force any policy, good or bad, loyal or disloyal upon our young people who in blind loyalty submit. Neither Conference nor our young people had any say in the selection of our first badge, nor when it was found unsatisfactory had they any choice as to the second. Our first Constitution did not comply with the action of Conference but our people did not know it, and to be loyal bought it and now that it too, has been found unsatisfactory, a second one is being printed which may be better and may be worse, but will be forced in the same way, neither Conference nor our societies having a word to say. Surely everybody knows better than somebody. Surely the experience of all our societies would be of some value in supplementing the experience of one man. I am not now criticising the Constitution, but the manner of it being forced on our people before being acted upon by them.

Again one of our K. C. cards invites people to the *Progressive church*, which church is not in existence and yet our people use them because they come from the board and they want to be loyal. Must we to be loyal accept everything sent out in the name of our church without murmur or complaint? I believe in intelligent loyalty. I believe in loyalty, not to creed or party, church or board, but to truth and right. I love the Brethren church because it loves the truth.

I am writing because I have the cause at heart and want to see it free from narrowness. Just now while we are yet in the formative period we need to guard lest by some narrow policy we be dragged at the wheels of progress instead of being at the front. If I read the times aright, the day of competition is almost past and the rosy fingers of the day of co-operation are reaching out over the youth of to-day with millennial blessings. God speed that day. Let us do nothing to retard it.

To remedy the defects in our policy which I have mentioned and to secure unity and co-operation and therefore enthusiasm and loyalty withal, I present for

consideration a few propositions which for the most part have been already adopted in Indiana and Kanemorado and widely endorsed by our leading men.

1. That our name be Kings' Children of Christian Endeavor. (K. C. because we want to rally under something our own.—C. E. for precisely the same reason that we call a Sunday-school a Sunday-school.)

2. That we adopt the C. E. Constitution. (It has proven itself in 42000 societies in 32 denominations.)

3. That our board be elected by Conference and its duties defined.

4. That we encourage such literature as will be necessary to keep our societies in touch with each other and direct their work.

5. That we have annual mass conventions of all the societies in the church.

We use the international lessons and co-operate in S. S. Conventions and for the same reason and many others we ought to co-operate in the young people's movement. Trusting that those wiser than I will take steps to inaugurate a right policy in regard to our work, I submit the above for what it is worth.

MY VIEW OF IT.

H. SHOMBER, M. D.

Speaking for myself, in regard to Query 4. No. 32, Volume XVII, BRETHREN EVANGELIST, I will say, that I very much appreciate them, regardless of personal acquaintance, so long as the biographies accompanying them are of such a character, as to make their lives worthy of imitation and emulation. To me, an occasional portrait accompanied by a biography of a brother or sister, who has been of more than ordinary service to humanity and to the cause of Christ, is both interesting and edifying, even though I never knew them personally. As I, at this particular time, look at the portraits of P. J. Brown, Julia Smith and Laura Robinson, in No. 31, Volume XVII BRETHREN EVANGELIST, and read and compare their biographies, I draw from the same, thoughts for reflection. P. J. Brown, I know well by reputation, but not personally, never having had the pleasure of meeting him, nor seeing his photograph, until I saw his portrait in the EVANGELIST and since I have read his biography in connection, I know more of Brother Brown, than I did prior to it.

He has done more for the real liberty-loving portion of the Dunkard Brethren, than I had any knowledge of; but as I examine his portrait as it appears in the EVANGELIST, I see a physiognomy expressive and indicative of such traits and qualities, as are portrayed in the short biographical sketch of his career.